UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,427	09/08/2003	Scott Anthony Arvin	G&C 30566.307-US-U1	9022

55895   7590   08/06/2008
GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/657,427
Filing Date: September 08, 2003
Appellant(s): ARVIN, SCOTT ANTHONY

Scott A. Arvin
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5/28/08 appealing from the Office action mailed

12/10/07.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,845,299	Arora et al.	12-1998
6,948,126	Malamud et al.	09-2005
5,396,590	Kreegar	03-1995

(9) **Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-33 and 35-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Arora et al. ("Arora" US Patent No. 5,845,299) in view of Malamud et al.

("Malamud" US Patent No. 6,948,126) and Kreegar et al. ("Kreegar" US Patent No. 5,396,590).

Regarding independent claim 1, Arora teaches a method for temporarily displaying

information relating to an object manipulator:

displaying a graphic object in a computer graphics program; displaying an object

manipulator on the graphic object; (i.e. "Properties" window related to items 502 and 504 in FIG.

5 et seq. of Arora);

wherein the object manipulator comprises a glyph or symbol that is used to modify a

property of the graphic object; (figure 9a-9d)

 Arora does not teach temporarily displaying information relating to the object

manipulator without activating the object manipulator.

Malamud teaches receiving cursor input wherein a cursor is placed over the object (i.e.

see tooltip associated with objects in FIGS. 2D-2H et seq. of Malamud).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the

cursor input of Maiamud into the information display of Arora. Said artisan would have been

motivated to combine Malamud into Arora so that through manipulation of the cursor the user is able to have displayed information about the object (i.e. see col. 1 line 52 et seq. of Malamud).

Kreegar teaches displaying information relating to the object manipulator without activating the object manipulator (i.e. col. 2 line 50 et seq. of Kreegar: "without having to activate different modes for different manipulations").

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the non-activation required manipulators of Kreegar into the temporary display of Arora as modified by Malamud. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Kreegar into the modified Arora to allow a user • to manipulate the objects without having to resort to alternative• methods of manipulation (i.e. col. 2 line 45 et seq. of Kreegar).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein temporarily displaying the information comprises changing a color of the object manipulator (i.e. compare "Color..." button in FIG. 3 et seq. of Arora with changes in object manipulators in Figs. 4(a)-5(e) et seq. of Kreegar),

wherein other object manipulators are displayed in close proximity on the graphic object such that it is difficult to distinguish which object manipulator will be activated as a result of pointing device activiation (i.e. note proximity of tooltip information to curosr in FIGS. 2D-2H et seq. of Malamud), and wherein the changing of the color distinguishes the object manipulator from the other object manipulator (i.e. compare "Color..." button in FIG. 3 et seq. of Arora with changes in object manipulators in Figs. 4(a)-5(e) et seq. of Kreegar).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises a value of the property to be modified by the object manipulator (i.e. "Properties" window related to items 502 and 504 in FIG. 5 et seq. of Arora).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the property comprises a dimensional property (i.e. "Width" and "Height" in pixels in FIG. 3 et seq. of Arora).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises a graphics visual representation of the graphic object indicating a potential change to a state of the graphic object (i.e. "Properties" window related to items 502 and 504 in FIG. 5 et seq. of Arora).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the potential change comprises potential results of interacting with the object manipulator (i.e. "sample text" in item 504, compare "Properties" window in FIG. 5 et seq. of Arora).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises a function of the object manipulator (i.e. note item 301 in Fig. 4(a) et seq. of Kreegar).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the function comprises a name of the property the object manipulator is used to modify (i.e. "Name Information Pointer" 26 in FIG. 2A et seq. of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information is displayed in a text message box (i.e. note box in "Name Information Pointer" 26 in FIG. 2A et seq. of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises a method used to modify a function of the object manipulator (i.e. note item 301 in Fig. 4(a) et seq. of Kreegar).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information is displayed immediately when the cursor is located over the object manipulator (i.e. compare object manipulators in Fig. 3 et seq. of Kreegar with information displayed when cursor over object in FIG. 2D et seq. of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information is displayed after a period of time has passed with the cursor located over the object manipulator (i.e. compare object manipulators in

Fig. 3 et seq. of Kreegar with information displayed when cursor over object in FIG. 2D et seq.
of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar
teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information is hidden from display after a period of
time has passed (i.e. compare related items with and without information in FIGS. 2D-2H et seq.
of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar
teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information remains displayed until a user activates
the object manipulator (i.e. compare object manipulators in Fig. 3 et seq. of Kreegar with
information displayed when cursor over object in FIG. 2D et seq. of Malamud).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Arora, in combination with Malamud and Kreegar
teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the information remains displayed until the cursor is
moved off of the object manipulator (i.e. compare object manipulators in Fig. 3 et seq. of
Kreegar with information displayed when cursor over object in FIG. 2D et seq. of Malamud).

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar m scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 30 is similar ~n scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar m scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar ~n scope to claim 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar tn scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 42 is similar in scope to claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 43 is similar tn scope to claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 44 is similar tn scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 45 is similar in scope to claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 46 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 47 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 48 is-similar in scope to claim 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's argument focused on the following:

A) Whether Arora teaches an object manipulator that used to modify a property of a graphical object?

A) Arora teaches an object manipulator because it provides users with a panel of tool objects that allows user to edit, modify, and manipulate graphical object. (see Arora. Col. 9, lines 40-50)

B) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach, disclose or suggest temporarily displaying information relating to an object manipulator that used to modify a property of a graphical object?

B) The combination of Malamud and Kreegard teaches displaying information relating to an object that used to modify property of a graphical object. Malamud teaches displaying relating information regarding the icon object when the cursor is placed over the icon. (see Malamud, col. 8, lines 15-40) Furthermore, the placement of the cursor does not activate the icon. (see Malamud, col. 8, lines 15-40) By combining the Malamud's teaching with object manipulator of Arora, (see Arora. Col. 9, lines 40-50) the combination teaches temporarily displaying information relating to an object manipulator that used to modify a property of a graphical object.

C) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach, disclose or suggest temporarily displaying information relating to an object manipulator that is used to modify a property of a graphic object without activating the object manipulator?

C) The combination Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teaches displaying information relating to an object manipulator that is used to modify a property of a graphic object without activating object manipulator. Malamud teaches displaying relating information regarding icon object without activating the icon. (see Malamud, col. 8, lines 15-40) Furthermore, Kreegar teach using the feature of object manipulator without activating the icon object itself. (see Kreegar, col. 2, lines 45) Therefore the combination of Malamud's teaching and Arora's object manipulator (see Arora. Col. 9, lines 40-50) teaches temporarily displaying information relating to an object manipulator that is used to modify a property of a graphic object without activating the object manipulator.

D) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach providing distinction in color between activated object and inactivated objects?

D) Kreegar creates such distinction by highlighting the activated object while leaving inactivated objects as they are. (see Kreegar, col. 6, lines 65-70) Therefore the combination of Kreegar's teaching with Arora's object manipulator (see Arora. Col. 9, lines 40-50) teaches changing color to distinguish one manipulated object from another un-manipulated object.

E) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach displaying value for a dimensional property?

E) Arora teaches displaying value for a dimensional property by showing the width and the height of the property window. (see Arora, col. 8, lines 50-60)

F) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach display a visual representation of graphics object wherein the visual representation indicates a change to the state of graphical object?

F) Kreegar teaches the visual representation indicates a change to state of graphical object by highlighting the activated object. (see Kreegar, col. 6, lines 65-70) The highlighting of the object indicates the graphical object is being manipulated. (see Kreegar, col. 6, lines 65-70) Therefore, Kreegar teaches the visual representation indicates a change to state of graphical object by highlighting the activated object.

G) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach a visual representation of the graphical object that indicates the result of interacting with the object manipulator?

G) Aroa teaches a visual representation of the graphical object that indicates the result of interacting with the object manipulator by provide sample texts that indicate the appearance of the document when the manipulator is used. (see Arora "sample text" in item 504, figure 5)

H) Whether Arora, Malamud, and Kreegar teach displaying a name of the property the
object manipulator is used to modify?

H) Malamud teaches displaying a name of the property the object manipulator is used to
modify by displaying object's title and its description when the cursor is moved over the icon.
(see Malamud, fig. 2j1. items 41 B)

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related
Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Peng Ke

/Peng Ke/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

Conferees:

Stephen Hong
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2173